

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_121006
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF EPIDEMIOLOGICAL DATA ON CHILDHOOD TUBERCULOSIS IN THE LAST DECADE IN SÃO PAULO
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is of significance to the scientific community because it highlights the importance of public health awareness. In addition, it presents the epidemiology of tuberculosis (TB) in children which reveals that all age groups are susceptible to TB. Furthermore, the information from the manuscript brings to light the importance of early diagnosis of TB as well as adequate treatment required to prevent further spread of the life-threatening infectious disease.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The author made a nice attempt in providing a good title for the article, however, based on the content of the manuscript, the title is not suitable. The manuscript is a review paper, hence, an alternative title that could be considered is Epidemiology of Tuberculosis in children of Sao Paulo – A comprehensive review	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The author provided a good abstract that conveys the required information, however, there are some errors which needs to be corrected. There was a discussion section in the abstract which is not required. Furthermore, it is advised that the abstract be short and concise so that the information presented, can be well understood.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I appreciate the authors organization of the manuscript into subsections. Also, the adequate representation of tables and figures in the manuscript is commendable.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The author made a great effort in organizing the manuscript, however, there are major deficiencies in the paper. There are some redundant sections which should be taken out. In addition, there are some grey areas in the manuscript which were not well presented/explained for clear understanding. This includes the information in some of the tables presented (example, table 2). Furthermore, the author stated in the title that the comparison will be for Sao Paulo, however, throughout the manuscript, other Brazilian capitals were included in the comparison. In addition, the author made some assertions in the literature review which I do not believe is scientifically accurate due to the lack of sufficient data to support the claim. Additionally, the author stated based on the title, that the study was for the last decade (10 years), however the data presented was from 2015 – 2022 which is not up to a decade. It is advised that the author edit the title of the manuscript to contain the appropriate information as presented in the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references provided are sufficient, however, inclusion of more recent references would be beneficial.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The author made a good attempt to convey the information in clear English language, however, the manuscript needs major revision for grammar, punctuations and sentence construction. The author has a good idea on the information that needs to be disseminated but has difficulty in communicating effectively. In addition, throughout the article, the author made use of ambiguous words which were inappropriate in the context they were applied. I would suggest that the author sticks to simpler terms that will clearly convey the scientific information.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author made a good attempt in presenting data from various sources to highlight the importance of public awareness on TB, nevertheless, there are some errors which the author needs to work on. Some include; excessive use of paragraphs, use of capital letters for in-text citations. In addition, it was observed that the author presented data on both TB in adolescents as well as children meanwhile the title of the article states that the comparison would be on children only. To this end, the calculations as well as the discussion section has to be revised if the review is to be on childhood TB alone.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Francisca Udegbe</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>The Ohio State University, USA</p>